REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, and the remarks that follow as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes and remarks are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1-7 are pending. Claims 1-7 are amended, without prejudice. No new matter is added by these amendments. Support for the amended recitations in the claims is found throughout the specification.

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 3 (but not claim 7, although the Examiner listed claim 7) because of informalities. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended herein to correct for any informalities. Consequently, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to claims 1 and 3 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, allegedly as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the specification does not describe an additional storage means that stores encoded data and multiplexed data. Although Applicants disagree, the amendment to claim 1 to recite "single

storage unit" renders the rejection moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the 112, first paragraph, rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-6 (and presumably claim 7) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, allegedly as being indefinite. The amendments to the claims obviate the rejection. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the 112, second paragraph, rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Katayama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,902,115). Applicants disagree. Katayama fails to teach or suggest the instant invention.

For example, claim 7, as amended herein, recites in part, "A data editing method...**wherein when each of said plurality of encoding devices receives an encode list from said system controller, then each of said plurality of encoding devices requires address information of a recording area of a single storage unit, and thereby said system controller specifies the recording area for each of said plurality of encoding devices and sends information of the specified recording area for each of said plurality of encoding devices**." (Underlining and Bold added for emphasis.)

It is respectfully submitted that the portions of Katayama relied upon by the Examiner neither disclose, suggest or motivate a skilled artisan to practice at least the above-recited feature of claim 7.

Katayama relates to a reproducing apparatus suitable for high-density recording mediums (column 1, lines 48-51). The instantly claimed invention, by contrast, provides for a plurality of encoding devices that when they receive an encode list from a system controller, then each of said plurality of encoding devices requires address information of a recording area of a

single storage unit, and thereby the system controller specifies the recording area for each of the plurality of encoding devices and sends information of the specified recording area for each of the plurality of encoding devices, as instantly claimed. As a result, Katayama fails to teach, suggest or motivate a skilled artisan to practice the instantly claimed invention. Therefore, the instant claims are believed to be distinguishable from Katayama for at least the reasons stated above.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Katayama be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has made of record, but not applied, a U.S. patent by Matsumi et al. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's explicit finding that this reference does not render the claims of the present application unpatentable.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference, there is the bases for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By: 

Samuel H. Megerditchian
Reg. No. 45,678
Tel. (212) 588-0800